

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement and examination of all of the claimed subject matter on the merits are respectfully requested in light of the remarks which follow.

### STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 22-45 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-21 were previously cancelled.

### RESTRICTION

The Examiner has required restriction to one of the following five groups:

Group I, Claim 22, drawn to a process for combating acarids comprising zinc sulphide;

Group II, Claims 23-35, drawn to a composition comprising zinc sulphide;

Group III, Claims 23, 32, 36 and 38, drawn to yarn, fibers or filaments made by a process comprising zinc sulphide;

Group IV, Claims 23, 32 and 37, drawn to an article made from a composition comprising zinc sulphide; and

Group V, Claims 39-45, drawn to a composite article comprising zinc sulphide.

In response to the restriction requirement, applicants hereby elect, with traverse, Group II, Claims 23-35, drawn to a composition comprising zinc sulphide.

The restriction requirement is traversed for several reasons.

First, the technical feature linking the claims is not simply zinc sulphide, but rather the fact that zinc sulphide has been found to have acarid properties which make it useful in compositions and methods for combating acarids. This novel technical feature links all of the claims.

Secondly, in the international phase of this application, claims relating to the various compositions and the use apparently were found to relate to a single invention as all of the claims were searched. This is indeed consistent with applicants' view of the technical feature linking all the claims. It is not understood how claims relating to the present invention can be considered to relate to a single invention in the international phase and yet, under the very same PCT rules, be found to not do so here. Indeed, such action appears to be inappropriate.

Thirdly, the subject matter of non-elected Groups III and IV overlaps with that of elected Group II, while Groups IV and V overlap as well. This shows that at least the non-elected compositions should be rejoined with the elected compositions and examined on the merits herein.

As a fourth point, it is submitted that the method of non-elected Group I is so intimately associated with the compositions of elected Group II that it is entirely appropriate to examine Group I together with elected Group II herein.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the restriction requirement is untenable. Withdrawal of the requirement and examination of all of the claims on the merits are respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 8, 2008

By: Mary Katherine Baumeister  
Mary Katherine Baumeister  
Registration No. 26254

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620